

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

04

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trudemark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                        | FI    | LING DATE  | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |           |      |
|--|-------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------|------|
| 09/966,841                             | (     | 09/27/2001 | Thomas P. Glenn      | M-9225 US 4983      |                  | M-9225 US | 4983 |
| 24251                                  | 7590  | 10/20/2003 |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |           |      |
| SKJERVEN MORRILL LLP<br>25 METRO DRIVE |       |            |                      | DINH, TUAN T        |                  |           |      |
| SUITE 700                              | DKIVL |            |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |           |      |
| SAN JOSE, CA 95110                     |       |            |                      | 2827                |                  |           |      |

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| •   | Application No.                        | Applicant(s)          | Ì                                      |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action   | 09/966,841                             | GLENN ET AL.          |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ,   | Examiner                               | Art Unit              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Tuan T Dinh                            | 2827                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address   |  |                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 15 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  |  |                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE   | PLY [check either a) or b)]            |                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.  b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |  |                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  |  |                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.⊠ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  |  |                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (a) 🔲 they raise new issues that would require further  | er consideration and/or search (       | see NOTE below);      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);   |  |                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (c) ☑ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  |  |                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceli</li><li>NOTE:</li></ul>  | ng a corresponding number of f         | inally rejected claim | s.                                     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject  | tion(s):                               |                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   | be allowable if submitted in a se      | eparate, timely filed | amendment                              |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:  |  | dered but does NO     | T place the                            |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | ause it is not directed SOLELY t       | o issues which were   | e newly                                |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we   |  |                       | and an                                 |  |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  |                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:   |  |                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:   |  |                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,8,9,25-30 and 32</u> .  |  |                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>5-7,10,24 a</u>   | <del></del> _                          |                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on 15 July 2   |  | •                     | Examiner.                              |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer  | nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). <u>1</u> | $\frac{2}{2}$ 1/1. A  | 1/- 1                                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:  |  | John B.               | Vigushin                               |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  | AU 2827               | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |

٠,

Continuation of 2. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive, since Goldfarb did show a post arranged in a checkerboard pattern (pad 54) of a PC board 52. Examiner still maintains a final office action mailed on 05/23/03.